

ELLIOTT & ELLIOTT, P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1508 Lady STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
selliott@elliottlaw.us

SCOTT ELLIOTT

TELEPHONE (803) 771-0555
FACSIMILE (803) 771-8010

May 31, 2018

VIA E-FILING

Ms. Jocelyn Boyd
Chief Clerk of the Commission
101 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, SC 29210

RE: Proposed Schedule for Pre-Filed Testimony and other matters in
Docket Nos. 2017-207-E, 2017-305-E, and 2017-370-E

Dear Ms. Boyd:

The issues in Docket No. 2017-370-E are for approval of the proposed merger and in the alternative, a prudency determination and rate relief under the abandonment provisions of S.C. Code Section 57-33-280(J). In Docket No. 2017-305-E, the ORS seeks rate relief under S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-27-920. In Docket No. 2017-207-E, FOE seeks rate relief; its abandonment prayer is moot. SCE&G and Dominion clearly have the burden of proof with respect to their request for approval of their merger as well as for SCE&G's request for a prudency determination of its abandonment. Further, SCE&G seeks rate reduction associated with its merger request and alternatively, seeks relief resulting from its abandonment of the construction of the nuclear reactors which will lead to higher rates to ratepayers. The ORS and FOE seek rate relief for ratepayers. These issues are inextricably intertwined. Consequently, SCE&G and Dominion have both the burden of proof and the burden of going forward in the combined dockets. Once SCE&G meets its burden of proof with respect to its request for rate relief, the burdens of proof and going forward shift to ORS and FOE (and other parties) to demonstrate that rates should be reduced.

Moreover, there are pending three motions to compel discovery in the three dockets. FOE has filed two motions to compel responses to three discovery requests. The ORS has filed its motion to compel discovery asserting that its investigation has revealed instances of secret SCE&G communications and raises the specter of crime and fraud (ORS Motion to Compel at page 4). As must now be apparent, the most compelling evidence to be adduced in the three dockets will be documentary evidence much of which is in the exclusive possession of SCE&G. The ORS, FOE and the remaining parties will not be able to prepare meaningful testimony without the benefit of these documents currently being withheld by SCE&G. It would be patently unfair to force these parties to pre-file testimony while the Commission has yet to act on the motions to compel. With all due

Ms. Jocelyn Boyd
Chief Clerk of the Commission
May 31, 2018
Page 2

respect, the Commission's failure to act on these motions prior to pre-filing deadlines would constitute a denial of due process.

I would support a pre-filing schedule similar to that proposed by the ORS March 8, 2018. No doubt, SCE&G is prepared to pre-file its testimony immediately. Requiring all other testimony in September allows the Commission time to act on pending motions to compel and for the parties to complete discovery.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

Sincerely,

ELLIOTT & ELLIOTT, P.A.



Scott Elliott

SE/lbk

cc: All parties of record. (Via electronic mail)